# Any T

## 1NC New

#### A] Interpretation: The Aff must defend not restricting all constitutionally protected speech on campus – they may not specify a subset of speech to not protect.

-Under this interpretation, the negative may not read PICs out of a specific type of speech – solves their offense because neither of us get to specify

#### The negative “any” is an indefinite that refers to all

**Cambridge Dictionary:** Cambridge Dictionary, Any, <http://dictionary.cambridge.org/grammar/british-grammar/quantifiers/any>.

**We use any before nouns to refer to indefinite or unknown quantities or an unlimited entity**: Did you bring any bread? **Mr Jacobson refused to answer any questions**. If I were able to travel back to any place and time in history, I would go to ancient China. **Any as a determiner has two forms: a strong form and a weak form. The forms have different meanings. Weak form any: indefinite quantities We use any for indefinite quantities in questions and negative sentences**. We use some in affirmative sentences: Have you got any eggs? I haven’t got any eggs. I’ve got some eggs. Not: I’ve got any eggs. We use weak form any only with uncountable nouns or with plural nouns: [talking about fuel for the car] Do I need to get any petrol? (+ uncountable noun) There aren’t any clean knives. They’re all in the dishwasher. (+ plural noun) Warning: We don’t use any with this meaning with singular countable nouns: Have you got any Italian cookery books? (or … an Italian cookery book?) Not: Have you got any Italian cookery book? Strong form any meaning ‘it does not matter which’ We use any to mean ‘it does not matter which or what’, to describe something which is not limited. We use this meaning of any with all types of nouns and usually in affirmative sentences. In speaking we often stress any:. (+ uncountable noun) When you make a late booking, you don’t know where you’re going to go, do you? It could be any destination. (+ singular countable noun) [talking about a contract for new employees] Do we have any form of agreement with new staff when they start? (+ singular countable noun) [a parent talking to a child about a picture he has painted] A: I don’t think I’ve ever seen you paint such a beautiful picture before. Gosh! Did you choose the colours? B: We could choose any colours we wanted. (+ plural countable noun) See also: Determiners and types of noun Some and any Any as a pronoun Any can be used as a pronoun (without a noun following) when the noun is understood. A: Have you got some £1 coins on you? B: Sorry, I don’t think I have any. (understood: I don’t think I have any £1 coins.) [parents talking about their children’s school homework] A: Do you find that Elizabeth gets lots of homework? Marie gets a lot. B: No not really. She gets hardly any. (understood: She gets hardly any homework.) A: What did you think of the cake? It was delicious, wasn’t it? B: I don’t know. I didn’t get any. (understood: I didn’t get any of the cake.) See also: Determiners used as pronouns Any of We use any with of before articles (a/an, the), demonstratives (this, these), pronouns (you, us) or possessives (his, their): Shall I keep any of these spices? I think they’re all out of date. Not: … any these spices? We use any of to refer to a part of a whole: Are any of you going to the meeting? I couldn’t answer any of these questions. I listen to Abba but I’ve never bought any of their music. **Any** doesn’t have a negative meaning on its own. It **must be used with a negative word to mean the same as no. Compare Not** **Any**: **there aren’t any biscuits left**. They’ve eaten them all. **No**: There are no biscuits left. They’ve eaten them all.

#### B] Violation

#### C] Net Benefits

#### 1] Legal context – SCOTUS has established that any means all.

**SCOTUS:** Supreme Court of the United States. United States v. Gonzales 520 U.S. 1 [Delivered by Justice O’Connor]. <https://supreme.justia.com/cases/federal/us/520/1/case.html>1997. RP

**The question we face is whether the phrase "any other term of imprisonment" "means what it says, or whether it should be limited to some subset"** of prison sentences, Maine v. Thiboutot, 448 U. S. 1, 4 (1980)-namely, only federal sentences. **Read naturally, the word "any" has an expansive meaning, that is, "one or some indiscriminately of whatever kind.**" Webster's Third New International Dictionary 97 (1976). **Congress did not add any language limiting the breadth of that word, and so we must read § 924(c) as referring to all "terms of imprisonment**," including those imposed by state courts. Cf. United States v. AlvarezSanchez, 511 U. S. 350, 358 (1994) (noting that statute referring to "any law enforcement officer" includes "federal, state, or local" officers); Collector v. Hubbard, 12 Wall. 1, 15 (1871) (**stating "it is quite clear" that a statute prohibiting the filing of suit "in any court" "includes the State courts as well as the Federal courts," because "there is not a word in the statute tending to show that the words 'in any court' are not used in their ordinary sense")**. There is no basis in the text for limiting § 924(c) to federal sentences.

#### 2] Limits -- they allow SO MANY affs – they can defend any type of speech—here’s things they could say we shouldn’t restrict: saying racism is bad, writing papers, having casual conversations, the list goes on and on—their interp literally allows them to write infinite affs

#### 3] Ground – if they can spec speech, they can defend literally any ridiculous Aff. Plans could say “don’t restrict the right to say racism is bad” – combined with a specific framework, negating is impossible. Affs could read a Kant framework and a plan “don’t restrict the right to say Deont is true”.

#### D] Voting issue

#### Topical version of the Aff solves their offense – they can just read it including all speech with an advantage area that’s specific to types of speech.

# Frontlines

## Definitions Dump

#### The use of any in the resolution is universal, as opposed to existential.

**Lallas:** Lallas, Jackson [Debated for Brentwood, liked theory a lot] “A DEFENSE OF T-ANY.” *LADI.* February 2017. RP

**There is a lot of debate about the meaning of the determiner any. In rounds the issue tends to be whether any is used in the universal or existential form.** Consider these sentences: (1) Did you debate any debaters? (2) Any debater could win that round. In (1) any seems to function as an existential. If you debated at least one debater, you would answer yes to the question. However, (2) operates as a universal – pick any debater and they should be able to win the round. **A good rule of thumb for telling the difference between a universal and existential any is the ‘almost test**,’ (See Carlson 1981, and Kadmon and Landman 1993). **Almost can only modify universal determiners** (Kadmon and Landman 1993). Consider: (3) Did you debate almost any debaters? (4) Almost any debater could win that round. We see that (3) is incoherent, but (4) still makes sense. (4) now has a smaller scope than (2), as some debaters would not be able to win the round. **Using the almost test, it’s clear that our current topic is an example of the universal any: (5) Public colleges and universities ought not prohibit almost any constitutionally protected speech. Though awkward, this sentence has a clear meaning**. It reads: “With a small amount of exceptions, constitutionally protected speech ought not be prohibited by public colleges and universities.” **Since the resolution passes the almost test, we know that it uses any as a universal determiner. This demonstrates that the semantics of the resolution favor a generic reading, as we would intuitively expect**. I will note that there is debate about the meaning of a universal any. However, I have not encountered an article advocating for a model allows the affirmative position to be the more accurate reading of the resolution. There is a lot of literature on the semantics of any and some of the articles are 300 + pages long, so it’s possible I missed something. **Another semantic justification for the negative position comes from the ‘widening effect’ of any** (Kadmon and Landman 1993). **Consider this example, slightly modified for clarity from Kadmon and Landman: (6) Owls hunt mice. (7) Any owl hunts mice. Although both sentences are generic, they conclude that (7) rules out exceptions more strongly than (6).** (7) applies to more cases than (6) so it is a broader statement. From an intuitive perspective, this happens because the determiner any emphasizes a statement’s generality. Now consider the following sentences: (8) Countries ought to prohibit the production of nuclear power. (9) Countries ought to prohibit any production of nuclear power. (10) In the United States, private ownership of handguns ought to be banned. (11) In the United States, all private ownership of handguns ought to be banned. (12) Public colleges and universities in the United States ought not restrict constitutionally protected speech. (13) Public colleges and universities in the United States ought not restrict any constitutionally protected speech. There are two observations to be made here that support the negative side of T - Any. The first is that (12) and (13) are analogous to the construction of (6) and (7), so the widening effect indicates that (13) applies to a larger quantity. The second is that the use of any seems to be very deliberate. Our past resolutions (8) and (10) were general statements that omitted universal determiners. The current topic does use a universal determiner, but clearly not for a grammatical reason as it could have easily been written as (12). The choice to use (13) deviates from this trend and highlights the fact that any should increase the scope of the topic. The existential interpretation treats any as superfluous and reads (13) in the same way as (12). (9) and (11) help illustrate why this choice is so significant; we read topics with universal determiners differently than the general versions omitting them. **Thus, it’s clear that the semantics of the resolution mandate the negative interpretation.** Since the focus of the article is about introducing a pragmatic defense of T – Any, I won’t go into reasons why semantics matter for topicality. If you want to learn more about semantics vs pragmatics, Nebel’s “The Priority of Resolutional Semantics” and Overing and Scoggin’s “In Defense of Inclusion” provide great starting points. With semantics out of the way, I’ll now offer some pragmatic arguments in favor of my position.

**Outweighs their evidence**

**a. Cites several grammatical theories, such as the almost test and widening effect**

**b. Considers the topic specifically, and the topic is a term of art.**

#### The use of the word “any” refers to all and is a negative indefinite.

**Kadmon and Landman:** Nirit Kadmon and Fred Landman [Grammar experts, and college professors] “Any.” *Linguistics and Philosophy.* August 1993. RP

**As is well known, any can function in two different ways. On the one hand, it can be a negative polarity item** - POLARITY SENSITIV on the other hand, it has what is called a 'free choice' inte FREE CHOICE (FC) any. In this paper, we will propose a unifie of the semantic and pragmatic effects of any, which applies to its uses. **The use of any as a negative polarity it is illustrated in (1) and (2). (1) I don't have any potatoes**. (2) \*I have any potatoes. According to Ladusaw 1979's well known analysis, negative polarity items (NPIs) are only licensed if they are in the scope of a downward entailing operator. A downward entailing (DE) operator is an operator that reverses the direction of entailment, roughly as specified in (3) (using > for entailment). (3) O is a DE operator iff if A => B then O(B) = O(A). On Ladusaw's account, example (1) is OK because any is in the scope of negation, which, as illustrated in (4), is a DE operator. (4) swim = move I don't move => I don't swim In example (2), any is not licensed, because there is no DE operator that any is in the scope of. Ladusaw's analysis elegantly accounts for a wide range of examples. Besides negative vs. affirmative pairs like (1) and (2), it deals, for example, with examples (5)-(8). (5) At most three girls saw anything. (6) \*At least three girls saw anything. (7) Every girl who saw anything was happy. (8) \*Some girl who saw anything was happy. Assuming, with Generalized Quantifier Theory, that determiners are two place relations between a nominal property and a verbal property, Ladu saw predicts that (5) and (7) are OK because the determiner at most three is DE on its second argument (as well as the first) and the determiner every is DE on its first argument. (6) and (8) are out because at least three and some are not DE on either argument. Ladusaw's analysis of polarity sensitivity is quite successful. It gives semantic content to Klima 1964's suggestion that NPIs are licensed by 'affective' expressions, and it improves upon the analysis of Baker (1970), which is based on licensing by overt negation, in that the notion of DE provides a uniform account of the licensing of NPIs in examples with and without negation. However, there remain some empirical and theoretical issues that Ladusaw's analysis leaves unresolved. We now turn to such issues. We note the four issues summarized in (9), on which we will comment in turn immediately below. (9) constitutes, in fact, a summary of our goals: what we set out to do in this paper is provide an analysis of any that can successfully deal with these four issues. (9)i. the connection between PS any and FC any (goal: a unified analysis); ii. any as an expression which indicates reduced tolerance of ex ceptions; iii. the distribution of the NPI as determined by its meaning and function; iv. empirical problems with the licensing of NPIs I. THE CONNECTION BETWEEN PS ANY AND FC ANY. (10)-(12) are ex amples of free choice any. (10) Any owl hunts mice. (11) Any lawyer could tell you that. (12) I would dance with anybody. Ladusaw (1979) offers a whole battery of arguments that show beyond doubt that PS any is an indefinite with an existential meaning. (Arguments for this are also given by Horn (1972) and others.) FC any, on the other hand, seems to have universal quantificational force. And this goes beyond mere appearance. **Carlson (1981) gives several arguments that FC any is in fact a universal quantifier.** A strong argument is the behavior of almost. Almost is an operator that can modify only universal determiners, as illustrated in (13)-(15). (13) Almost every lawyer could answer that question.(14)Almostnolawyer (15)\*Almostsomelaw As (16) and (17) show, alm strongly suggests that FC (16)Almostanylawye (17)\*Idon'thavealmo (This goes back to Horn absolutely. Note that we alm ost is a sentential ad conclusion - towards w ambiguous:PS any is a universal quantifier.

**Outweighs their definition**

**a. It takes into account the specific grammar rule and the resolution**

**b. Cites experts on grammar**

#### “Any constitutionally protected speech” refers to every use of speech

**Merriam Webster:** “Definition of Any”, *Merriam-Webster*, accessed 2 Dec 2016, https://www.merriam- webster.com/dictionary/any.

1: one or some indiscriminately of whatever kind: a: one or another taken at random <ask any man you meet> b: **every —used to indicate one selected without restriction <any child would know that>**

Outweighs – common usage

#### Indefinites are generic

**McNair:** McNair, John “What’s the Rule?” 1983. RP

Sometimes I am asked to quote the rule about the use of plural verbs with indefinite pronouns. If a person knew just where to find such a rule, then he could proceed with a clear conscience. I hate to tell callers this, but there really isn't one rule that applies to all circum- stances. First of all, there is the differ- ence between British and American usage. Whereas both American and British writers often use plural verbs with indefinite pronouns, H. W. Fow- ler, British, simply dismisses all such instances as a common grammatical blunder. On the other hand, Bergen Evans, American, advocates choosing verbs that reflect the writer's meaning. There are really two problems. The first is whether indefinite pronouns can be followed by plural verbs, and the second is whether plural personal pronouns can be used to refer ot indefinite pronouns. AS you can see, **indefinite pronouns are those that refer to individuals without specifying which ones: anyone, anybody, someone, everybody, each, someone, either, neither, or none. Although grammar books and some dictionaries say they are singular, some of them (neither, none) usually take a plural verb. Anyone, everyone, and each usually take a singular verb, as in has everyone signed up, but if an of phrase follows the indefinite pronoun, a plural verb is often used**. Each of them were to be considered. Suppose we must shoose between Either of them are well qualified or Either of them is a good choice. Is one sentence categorically wrong? Bergen Evans says that in instances were either means both or each, it is followed by a plural verb. That is standard American usage. **When either means only one, it is followed by a singular verb**. Use of a singular or plural verb, then, often depends on what the writer means.

#### “Any constitutionally protected speech” refers to every use of speech

**Merriam Webster:** “Definition of Any”, *Merriam-Webster*, accessed 2 Dec 2016, https://www.merriam- webster.com/dictionary/any.

1: one or some indiscriminately of whatever kind: a: one or another taken at random <ask any man you meet> b: **every —used to indicate one selected without restriction <any child would know that>**

#### Any is defined as every

Your Dictionary (Your Dictionary, online reference, “any,” http://www.yourdictionary.com/any///

**every: any child can do it**

#### Legal restrictions use any to refer to all

Black’s Law (Black’s Law Dictionary, online legal dictionary, “Law Dictionary: What is ABANDONMENT OF CHILD?” http://thelawdictionary.org/abandonment-of-child

**What is ABANDONMENT** OF CHILD? **Deserting** a child and having no intention of fulfilling **any obligations** to the child. **Cutting off** all **relations** and obligations to the child.

#### Any is an indefinite pronoun that refers to things generally

Language (Online English grammar textbook, Unit 42: - Indefinite Pronouns,” http://www.1-language.com/englishcoursenew/unit42\_grammar.htm

**Indefinite pronouns replace specific things with** general, non-specific concepts. For example: - I want to live abroad in Italy. - I want to live abroad somewhere. This unit covers **indefinite pronouns** made with some, **any**, no, and every. Some / any Some and any can be combined with "-thing" to refer to an undefined object. For example: - There's someone outside the door. - There isn't anyone in the office. Some and any can be combined with "-where" to refer to an undefined location. For example: - I'm looking for somewhere to live. - We don't want to live anywhere near here. Some and any can be combined with "-body" or "-one" to refer to an undefined person. There is very little difference in meaning between "-body" and "-one". For example: - If you have a problem, someone/somebody will help you. - Do you know anyone/anybody who can help? These compound nouns follow the same rules as some and any, that is some is used in affirmative statements, and **any is used in negative statements and questions.** For example: - I need something from the supermarket. - **I don't need anything from the supermarket.** - Do you need anything from the supermarket?

#### Any refers to a broadening – it expands the scope to include everything

Simon 16 (Cecilia, reporter @ the NY Times, “Fighting for Free Speech on America’s Campuses,” August 1, 2016,

**Title IX prohibits discrimination** based on sex in federally funded educational programs. In the last five years, as **the government** has worked to crack down on sexual assault on campus, it **has broadened the definition of sexual harassment to “*any* unwelcome conduct of a sexual nature” and eliminated a protection that such conduct had to be offensive** to a reasonable person.

### A2 Cambridge Any

#### It’s miscut – they use any in the negative sense to refer to NONE – in the context of this resolution, that means the Aff would allow NO RESTRICTIONS on free speech

**Cambridge Dictionary defines any:** Cambridge Dictionary “Any” <http://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/any>. RP

**(used in** [**negative**](http://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/negative)[**statements**](http://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/statement) **and** [**questions**](http://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/question)**)** some, or [**even**](http://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/even) **the** [**smallest**](http://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/small)[**amount**](http://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/amount) (of): **We didn’t have any** [**idea**](http://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/idea) **what the** [**airfare**](http://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/airfare) **would be.** There was [hardly](http://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/hardly) any [snow](http://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/snow) this [winter](http://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/winter). Is there any [hope](http://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/hope) that he will [recover](http://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/recover)? Are any of the [concerts](http://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/concert) on a [Saturday](http://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/saturday) [night](http://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/night)?

## Standards Top Level

### Limits XT

#### Extend limits – they allow an absurd number of Affs – here’s a caselist – the right to say racism bad, the right to have a conversation, writing papers, and more. These Affs have empirically been read – the journalism Aff, speech zones Aff, right for white people to speak, criticize the military Aff, and more. These explode the topic but are also UNBEATABLE – nobody thinks people shouldn’t have the right to say racism is bad.

### Field Context XT Ev

#### Legal context – tons of court rulings have established “any” as “all”.

**Elder:** Elder (David S. Elder, October 1991, "Any and All": To Use Or Not To Use?” "Plain Language' is a regular feature of the Michigan Bar Journal, edited by Joseph Kimble for the State Bar Plain English Committee. Assistant editor is George H. Hathaway,

**The Michigan Supreme Court seemed to approve our dictionary definitions of "any" in Harrington v Interstate Business Men's Accident** Ass'n, 210 Mich 327, 330; 178 NW 19 (1920), when it quoted Hopkins v Sanders, 172 Mich 227; 137 NW 709 (1912). **The Court defined "any" like this: "In broad language, it covers 'arl'v final decree' in 'any suit at law or in chancery' in 'any circuit court.' Any' means ,every,' 'each one of all."'** In a later case**, the Michigan Supreme Court again held that the use of "any" in an agency contract meant "all." In Gibson v Agricultural Life** Ins Co, 282 Mich 282, 284; 276 NW 450 (1937), the clause in controversy read: "14. The Company shall have, and is hereby given a first lien upon any commissions or renewals as security for any claim due or to become due to the Company from said Agent." (Emphasis added.) **The Gibson court was not persuaded by the plaintiff's insistence that the word "any" meant less than "all": "Giving the wording of paragraph 14 oJ the agency contract its plain and unequivocable meaning, upon arriving at the conclusion that the sensible connotation of the word any' implies 'all' and not 'some,'** the legal conclusion follows that the defendant is entitled to retain the earned renewal commissions arising from its agency contract with Gibson and cannot be held legally liable for same in this action," Gibson at 287 (quoting the trial court opinion). **The Michigan Court of Appeals** has **similarly interpreted the word "any" as used in a Michigan statute. In McGrath v Clark**, 89 Mich App 194; 280 NW2d 480 (1979), the plaintiff accepted defendant's offer of judgment. The offer said nothing about prejudgment interest. **The statute the Court examined was MCL 600.6013; MSA 27A.6013: "Interest shall be allowed on any money judgment recovered in a civil action...." The Court held that "the word 'any' is to be considered all-inclusive,"** so the defendants were entitled to interest. McGrath at 197 Recently, the Court has again held that "[alny means 'every,' 'each one of all,' and is unlimited in its scope." Parker v Nationwide Mutual Ins Co, 188 Mich App 354, 356; 470 NW2d 416 (1991) (quoting Harrington v InterState Men's Accident Ass'n, supra)

#### Flag desecreation statutes prove.

Danilina S., [staff writer for black’s law dictionary], “Is Flag Burning Illegal?”. *Blacks Law Dictionary.* RP

Interesting that the burning of the flag has been against the law until 1969. The first U.S. Supreme Court ruling on flag desecration was passed in 1907 in Halter vs. Nebraska case. **Most early flag desecration statutes prohibited burning a flag or any other ways of disrespecting the flag.** Later, in 1968, Congress responded to the burning of the American flag in the Central Park as the protest against the Vietnam War by passing the Federal Flag Desecration Law. **This law prohibited** any **display of “contempt” directed against the flag. Thus, burning of the American flag had been** illegal until 1969 when the Supreme Court ruled the decision to award the First Amendment protection to the burning of the flag.

### Ground XT Ev

#### Specific plans on this topic cause massive ground loss – there are few enough neg args as is.

**Lallas:** Lallas, Jackson [Debated for Brentwood, liked theory a lot] “A DEFENSE OF T-ANY.” *LADI.* February 2017. RP

**Whenever the aff strategically chooses an advocacy, it is a given that aff ground improves. The aff gets to exclude many neg positions and defend the best slice of the resolution. There’s also the frontlining advantage in only having to defend one plan while negatives need to be ready for a variety of cases.** On many topics this is fine or even required. For instance, whole res debate could be impossibly vague or hard to defend. The neg could also get a ground boost in return to even out these advantages. Perhaps the aff plan will give the neg DAs about implementation, is too narrow so that an advantage CP easily solves it, or strengthens links to core generics. **But this is not the case on the current topic. Specification dramatically improves aff ground while limiting neg options**. As this section header suggests, there are few case negs in quantity and quality. Allow me to explain. **Almost every neg position comes from one of three topic areas: hate / offensive speech, protest, or generic kritiks of free speech. The first is by far the broadest category, encompassing the hate speech DA, revenge porn DA, title IX DA, offensive speakers DA, alt right DA, anti-Semitism DA, counter-speech kritiks, positions about safe spaces, etc. Negatives occasionally read positions against protest, most prominently the endowments DA and heg DA. Lastly there are some kritiks of the concept of free speech itself, the cap K being the best example. That’s pretty much it**. Despite the current topic’s broadness, my experience researching, judging, coaching, and looking through the NDCA wiki indicates that there are very few arguments beyond these in favor of negating. Many arguments against free speech are already excluded because the resolution includes the words “constitutionally protected.” That’s not to say the remaining neg arguments are bad – some like hate speech are very well defended in the literature. **What’s worrying is that in the big picture there are only a few ways to argue against free speech. These lines of argumentation quickly dissipate when talking about specific speech. This effect skews ground in favor of specific affs. The quality of neg ground is inversely correlated to the aff ’s instead of roughly equivalent. Consider having to defend absolute free speech. There are good arguments in favor of it – the marketplace of ideas and individual liberty – but also strong counter arguments such as libel, hate crimes, and harassment. Now narrow that to constitutionally protected speech. The same market place and liberty arguments apply, but the objections have either disappeared or become much weaker. For instance, hate crimes and harassment have been narrowed to just hate speech while the libel objection is altogether gone**. Now narrow it again to just constitutionally protected speech in college newspapers. I would argue that the ground in favor of this speech is even stronger than the ground favoring absolute or constitutionally protected free speech.

### Limits XT Ev

#### Their interp explodes limits – there are literally thousands of speech codes they could choose to overturn, different areas of campuses, and more.

**Lallas:** Lallas, Jackson [Debated for Brentwood, liked theory a lot] “A DEFENSE OF T-ANY.” *LADI.* February 2017. RP

**LD** **has had its share of deeply under-limited topics, such as environmental protection vs resource extraction, nuclear power, and beneficence. But under the affirmative interpretation, this topic is just as bad if not worse than many of them. The existential reading includes cases such as ones that specify a single type of speech or mode of communication. Even if we apply further limits, such as requiring the aff advocacy to get rid of a specific speech code, there are still far too many affs. The Foundation for Individual Rights in Education (FIRE) provides some helpful statistics that demonstrate the scope of the resolution. In their 2017 survey of speech codes, they reviewed at 345 public colleges. 33.9% of these schools had a red light rating**. Using the data provided, we can also see that about 59% of public colleges surveyed had a yellow light rating. To put this in perspective we need to understand the methodology behind the survey. FIRE defined a red light rating as: “A red light institution is one that has at least one policy both clearly and substantially restricting freedom of speech, or that bars public access to its speech- related policies by requiring a university login and password for access.” A yellow light rating is slightly more complicated: “A yellow light institution maintains policies that could be interpreted to suppress protected speech or policies that, while clearly restricting freedom of speech, restrict only narrow categories of speech . . . Yellow light policies are typically unconstitutional, and a rating of yellow light rather than red light in no way means that FIRE condones a university’s restrictions on speech. Rather, it means that in FIRE’s judgment, those restrictions do not clea rly and substantially restrict speech in the manner necessary to warrant a red light rating.” But maybe these limits aren’t so bad – what if these universities only have one policy that caused the red or yellow light rating? These are the assumptions that the aff interpretation would need to make and they are far too generous. **Realistically, these schools have multiple codes that FIRE takes issue with. There are also roughly 1600 public colleges in the United States. The survey only looks at 345. When you combine these facts, the number of possible affs just about speech codes is likely in the hundreds and maybe thousands. Keep in mind that speech code affs are only a subset of those allowed by the aff interpretation**. In reality there are more ways to limit content of speech and modes of communication, a common example on this topic being free speech zones. The aff interpretation would allow for these too, which makes it even more under-limited. **There’s already plenty of literature about the impacts of under-limited topics, but to name a few: rounds have less clash and substantive engagement, new debaters have a harder time joining the activity, negatives design strategies that moot the aff as an alternative to doing research, more topicality debates, etc.**

### A2 Generics Solve

#### 1] Still bad ground – neg reads generics and the aff always beats us with specifics, which means it’s still unfair.

#### 2] Generics don’t apply – mechanisms and implementation vary so no process CP’s and each state has different people, which means no such thing as generics on this topic.

#### 3] This is defense – if there’s a risk our interpretation is net better for predictability or limits that outweighs.

### A2 CI Your Interp + Our Aff

#### 1] You arbitrarily artificially limit the topic by creating a line where some affs are allowed and some aren’t with no clear method—means your ad hoc limits to the counter-interpretation are unjustifiable—obviously the optimal interp isn’t to our interp plus *only your aff*—it also mitigates most of your offense if you do get that internal link—it applies to any net benefit to both interps.

#### 2] Norming disad—there’s no way one decision sets a norm that *only one aff* is allowed in addition to whole rez—the topic is the stasis point—it’s a question of whether it’s reasonable to prep for your aff after looking at it—allowing just your aff may limit the topic, but it doesn’t create *predictable limits*, which are key to neg prep—means even if you technically limit, you don’t access our internal link.

### A2 Aff Flex

#### No link to Aff flex – whole res gives them great ground – most people think free speech is good.

**Lallas:** Lallas, Jackson [Debated for Brentwood, liked theory a lot] “A DEFENSE OF T-ANY.” *LADI.* February 2017. RP

The ground argument thus far is still incomplete. It could be the case that specification is necessary to offset bad aff whole res ground or general disadvantages to affirming. More specific variants of these arguments, such as the pics objection, will be covered in a later section. For now I’ll address this concern at the general level. First note that the work done above shows that the negative incurs a substantial ground loss when the aff violates T – Any. When comparing the difficulty of affirming to the limitation of neg ground, the neg comes out ahead. **Affirming may not be easy but negating against these affs is too hard to justify the tradeoff**. However, this objection needs to be covered in more depth. If the ground loss from violating T – Any turned out to not be that bad then the weighing argument would not hold. M**y next response to this argument is that the premise that whole res leaves the aff with bad ground does not apply. As a society we overwhelmingly favor free speech and there are years of defending it in the literature. Things like hate speech have been heavily covered through controversial Supreme Court cases in the past (Skokie comes to mind) and free speech on college campuses has been a big topic in the literature from the 90s to the present. It seems clear that the aff has plenty of arguments to choose from and also that there has been a dialogue among scholars which can help answer common negative positions.**

#### Getting better at debate solves the Aff flex terminal impact.

**Lallas:** Lallas, Jackson [Debated for Brentwood, liked theory a lot] “A DEFENSE OF T-ANY.” *LADI.* February 2017. RP

**There is also a side bias component to this argument. Is affirming is hard enough that the aff needs to be abusive to win?** I think this question is worthy of an article by itself given how prevalent it is, so for the sake of brevity I won’t go into too much depth on it here. **Firstly, I think this response misdiagnoses the problem. Affirming is hard because it requires more work to write a good aff and know how to execute it well. Much fear about affirming could be alleviated by doing more work.**

#### Side bias flips Aff on this topic

**Lallas:** Lallas, Jackson [Debated for Brentwood, liked theory a lot] “A DEFENSE OF T-ANY.” *LADI.* February 2017. RP

I also think that the difficulty often comes from non-substantive concerns. Theory and Kritiks have been classically hard strategies for the aff to deal with. It’s layering more than any neg substantive advantage that causes the problem. Specific advocacies are a misguided way to address the issue. **Lastly I don’t think that affirming is that difficult on this topic. Almost any theory interpretation against a whole res aff is frivolous and stock aff arguments interact well with kritiks. The set of neg arguments on substantive is already not super expansive which makes it very manageable to prep them out. The high quality whole res ground mentioned earlier also helps answer this argument.** Side bias statistics would be helpful in gauging the accuracy of this argument.

#### They have plenty of Aff flexibility as is – they can read differnet Affs and advantage areas.

**Lallas:** Lallas, Jackson [Debated for Brentwood, liked theory a lot] “A DEFENSE OF T-ANY.” *LADI.* February 2017. RP

**Like the staleness objection, this argument relies on the premise that the aff will have to defend the same thing every round. It is usually explained as: “If the aff is forced to defend only whole res, then it will be crushed by prepped negatives who can read anything.** There needs to be flexibility in advocacies available to the aff.” **One issue with this response is that it doesn’t translate well to the topic. There’s a fairly limited amount of negative ground. This makes it equally likely that the aff will be highly prepped for whatever the neg reads and also allows the aff to gear the AC strategically to be ready for those positions. But this argument again underestimates the variety still possible in whole res debate. The aff can choose any framework, advantage, and underview combination best for each round. New weighing and framing arguments can easily take the neg off their prep. Evidence comparison can be prepped for key arguments in the AC. True; a bad whole res case might almost always lose to the negative. But the same could be said about a bad plan.** A prepped aff that knows how to execute their case can easily offset the lack of flexibility. From my own observation, whole res cases seem to do pretty well on the topic.

#### Their flex goes too far – limits and ground outweigh.

**Lallas:** Lallas, Jackson [Debated for Brentwood, liked theory a lot] “A DEFENSE OF T-ANY.” *LADI.* February 2017. RP

**Lastly, there’s a deeper question about what makes a legitimate flexibility argument. Nibs, multiple condo, multiple pics, 10 theory shells, etc would all add tremendously to neg flexibility and yet these are obviously bad norms. That’s because flexibility is a balancing act, a position can be justified on the basis of flexibility if it doesn’t significantly disadvantage your opponent. The limits and ground arguments from the second section demonstrate why we should reject this form of flexibility.**

### A2 Bans Vary

#### 1] This is a lie—bans don’t change just for the type of speech—that’s absurd—empirically disproven by the fact that SCOTUS rules on speech codes

#### 2] No reason that differences in specific bans change clash—we don’t defend those, so there’s still core clash over whether a total ban is good.

#### 3] turn – your terminal impact is clash—if we win our limits argument, then clash is constrained by our ability to prep for your aff.

### A2 Disclosure Solves

#### Disclosure and solvency advocate don’t solve limits – it’s still a ton of random Affs to prep.

**Lallas:** Lallas, Jackson [Debated for Brentwood, liked theory a lot] “A DEFENSE OF T-ANY.” *LADI.* February 2017. RP

A classic and reasonable response to any limits argument, this argument usually goes as follows: “**The aff counter interpretation requires a solvency advocate and for the aff case to be disclosed,** which ensures that the neg has ample ground and can prepare before the round.” One immediate issue is that debaters try to get away with too much from this argument. **The case neg scarcity argument is unaddressed. True, there’s a greater chance that the neg will know what arguments to prep before the round. But those arguments are still limited in quality and quantity**, so the disclosure and solvency advocate requirements don’t solve for the neg ground loss inherent to violating T – Any. The debate about whether or not these requirements solve the limits concern requires closer inspection. **One obvious case that these arguments do not solve is new affs. New affs are usually not disclosed, and if they are the disclosure is only minutes before a debate**. This leaves the negative with not nearly enough time to prep and is particularly concerning in later elim rounds, where breaking random advocacies can be used as a tool to deliberately prevent the neg from engaging. **Outside of new affs, disclosure and solvency advocates will mitigate but not solve limits concerns. Before a tournament, most debaters don’t meticulously comb the wiki and prep out every aff that they could hit. And it would be wrong to make them – high school students shouldn’t have to dedicate their whole lives to debate**. Most prep against specific affs occurs during tournaments. **Even if disclosure gives the neg a 30 – 60 minute window to prep before round, there will still be a large prep skew in favor of the aff**. **The neg will certainly have an easier time debating a disclosed aff with a solvency advocate, but those requirements won’t solve all the limits abuse.**

#### 1] This is a terrible precedent for debate—disclosure doesn’t make your aff topical—justifies you reading your presumed consent aff because it was sweet and being like “it’s disclosed let me do what I want.”

#### 2] There are way too many potential affs—just because you disclose it doesn’t mean we can prep—our limits arg still applies—if one million affs are on the wiki, there’s no anyone is gonna have answers to all of them—limits takes this out.

#### 3] It’s the TOC—disclosing it doesn’t help when you’re gonna read a new aff every round.

### A2 Artificially Overlimits

#### 1] No impact – if we win our model for debate is better, then you should still vote for us—it’s just like a condo debate—there’s no official rule saying condo is bad but that’s not a reason you shouldn’t vote on condo.

#### 2] You still get your aff—just pick one of the two and you can read all of your advantages—you just have to give us disads from other things that you exclude—solves 100% of your offense but still gives us some chance to debate.

### A2 Solvency Advocate

#### Disclosure and solvency advocate don’t solve limits – it’s still a ton of random Affs to prep.

**Lallas:** Lallas, Jackson [Debated for Brentwood, liked theory a lot] “A DEFENSE OF T-ANY.” *LADI.* February 2017. RP

A classic and reasonable response to any limits argument, this argument usually goes as follows: “**The aff counter interpretation requires a solvency advocate and for the aff case to be disclosed,** which ensures that the neg has ample ground and can prepare before the round.” One immediate issue is that debaters try to get away with too much from this argument. **The case neg scarcity argument is unaddressed. True, there’s a greater chance that the neg will know what arguments to prep before the round. But those arguments are still limited in quality and quantity**, so the disclosure and solvency advocate requirements don’t solve for the neg ground loss inherent to violating T – Any. The debate about whether or not these requirements solve the limits concern requires closer inspection. **One obvious case that these arguments do not solve is new affs. New affs are usually not disclosed, and if they are the disclosure is only minutes before a debate**. This leaves the negative with not nearly enough time to prep and is particularly concerning in later elim rounds, where breaking random advocacies can be used as a tool to deliberately prevent the neg from engaging. **Outside of new affs, disclosure and solvency advocates will mitigate but not solve limits concerns. Before a tournament, most debaters don’t meticulously comb the wiki and prep out every aff that they could hit. And it would be wrong to make them – high school students shouldn’t have to dedicate their whole lives to debate**. Most prep against specific affs occurs during tournaments. **Even if disclosure gives the neg a 30 – 60 minute window to prep before round, there will still be a large prep skew in favor of the aff**. **The neg will certainly have an easier time debating a disclosed aff with a solvency advocate, but those requirements won’t solve all the limits abuse.**

#### Doesn’t solve – there are tons of solvency advocates in the lit—proven by the affs people are reading—and what a “solvency advocate” is is too vague—it doesn’t mean anything. Even if it does, there could still be tons of solvency advocates, so it doesn’t check limits.

#### Non-falsifiable – you haven’t justified why a solvency advocate solves the predictability internal link nor quantified the amount you solve—err neg here.

### A2 Topic Literature

#### Even if their Aff is uniquely important to debate, limits control the internal link.

**Lallas:** Lallas, Jackson [Debated for Brentwood, liked theory a lot] “A DEFENSE OF T-ANY.” *LADI.* February 2017. RP

This argument is another common response to most T arguments, so naturally it applies to T – Any. **Aff debaters will respond to T by arguing that: “Case [x] is important to talk about and adds educational value to the activity**.” I agree with this argument in spirit. There are a lot of important decisions and policies to talk about, and I’m sure many of the affs that violate T – Any fall among these. **The problem with this argument is that it does not justify why allowing these specific advocacies is a good way to go about learning these issues. In essence, this argument talks about the impact of learning about their position but skirts doing the link work explaining how their interpretation achieves that goal. This response can easily be link turned. If you don’t have the prep to engage their aff, due to limits or poor quality ground, then the in round discussion created is probably not that valuable. The round could teach both debaters more by having them debate on an issue with equitable ground, allowing clash and creating more strategic decisions**

#### People are just forced to generics under their interp and never really debate the Aff.

**Lallas:** Lallas, Jackson [Debated for Brentwood, liked theory a lot] “A DEFENSE OF T-ANY.” *LADI.* February 2017. RP

**A deeper concern is that these affs incentivize bad engagement. An example of this was the 50 states counterplan seen commonly against plans last year. Instead of creating an actual discussion of the aff, rounds have been bogged down by random implementation issues and cheap shot neg strategies. I find that many neg positions read in response to these affs are about as engaging as moral skepticism.** The incentive to read word pics and uplayer I mentioned in response to the pics objection also applies here.

#### 1] We only lose hyper-specific parts of the topic lit that we wouldn’t be able to research all of anyway—our interp lets you have the core clash of the topic lit still.

#### 2] Limits internal link turns it—we never get all of the topic lit since there’s too much to prep for, so either your impacts are inevitable or you magnify them by forcing people to resort to generics against hyper-specific affs.

#### 3] No terminal impact to topic literature—advocacy skills outweigh since they’re the way we apply topic lit in the real world AND they’re key to solve [x] in the real world, which the 1AC says is the biggest impact—no reason topic lit does that.

#### Our interp doesn’t foreclose that possibility—just read your specific arguments as advantages.

#### Limits internal link turns—we never get access to *discussions* if the neg is never able to engage—even if your education is good, that doesn’t mean your interp makes it valuably debateable—the specific discussions you demand should be a dialogue, not a monologue, which limits controls the link to.

### A2 Policy Simulation

#### 1] Non-unique—just talk about more generic policies—no reason policy simulation about incredibly specific places is key. We still let you talk about policies—most status quo speech laws don’t specify as far as *type of speech* anyway.

#### 2] Advocacy skills outweighs—policy education is useless unless we can apply it directly to the real world—advocacy skills are key to solve [x] in the real world, which the 1AC says is the biggest impact—no reason policy education does that. Even policy skill is useless without ability to advocate solutions or policies once you understand the policy process.

### A2 Whole Res Gets Stale

#### Whole res doesn’t get stale, since there are various nuances – it’s also non-unique, since people will just read the same cheaty plans.

**Lallas:** Lallas, Jackson [Debated for Brentwood, liked theory a lot] “A DEFENSE OF T-ANY.” *LADI.* February 2017. RP

**Some people argue that the topic could go stale if we adopt an interpretation such as T – Any, which admittedly puts a lot of restrictions on what the aff can defend. The argument goes:** “There won’t be a variety of positions to defend or research, so people will get bored of doing the same thing over and over.” **You should be skeptical of this argument from the outset. What people find fun in debate is highly subjective.** I enjoyed theory debate but would certainly not want it to be in every round. **This argument is also empirically denied. Take the example of sports – the rules of the game practically never change but people still enjoy playing. Within debates there can still be a ton of variety under whole res constraints. The aff can choose different frameworks and advantages, while the neg can respond with any combination of the arguments I listed earlier and more. There are strategic incentives to innovate, as talked about with new affs, so it’s likely debate wouldn’t get too stale. Lastly, the staleness argument is not unique. The domestic violence plan was ubiquitous on the jan feb last year and led to some pretty boring rounds.**

#### They have plenty of Aff flexibility as is – they can read differnet Affs and advantage areas.

**Lallas:** Lallas, Jackson [Debated for Brentwood, liked theory a lot] “A DEFENSE OF T-ANY.” *LADI.* February 2017. RP

**Like the staleness objection, this argument relies on the premise that the aff will have to defend the same thing every round. It is usually explained as: “If the aff is forced to defend only whole res, then it will be crushed by prepped negatives who can read anything.** There needs to be flexibility in advocacies available to the aff.” **One issue with this response is that it doesn’t translate well to the topic. There’s a fairly limited amount of negative ground. This makes it equally likely that the aff will be highly prepped for whatever the neg reads and also allows the aff to gear the AC strategically to be ready for those positions. But this argument again underestimates the variety still possible in whole res debate. The aff can choose any framework, advantage, and underview combination best for each round. New weighing and framing arguments can easily take the neg off their prep. Evidence comparison can be prepped for key arguments in the AC. True; a bad whole res case might almost always lose to the negative. But the same could be said about a bad plan.** A prepped aff that knows how to execute their case can easily offset the lack of flexibility. From my own observation, whole res cases seem to do pretty well on the topic.

### A2 PICs

#### Reading theory on PICs solves – double bind, either PICs are heinously unfair and they’ll crush on theory, or they’re not that bad and the limits offense outweighs.

#### Turn – they incentivize MORE PICS – negs that don’t have prep against random Affs will go for word PICs or process counterplans.

**Lallas:** Lallas, Jackson [Debated for Brentwood, liked theory a lot] “A DEFENSE OF T-ANY.” *LADI.* February 2017. RP

**Furthermore, reading an aff that violated T – Any would only increase the incentive to read pics. Because of the lack of neg ground and high chance that the neg won’t be able to prep the aff, the neg has every incentive to read word pics or random process pics. Even if the neg doesn’t read a pic, the ground skew still incentivizes reading a position that moots the aff and mimics the abuse of pics.**

#### The PICs offense is non-unique – any theoretical reason a PIC is bad is a reason a super small plan is bad

**Lallas:** Lallas, Jackson [Debated for Brentwood, liked theory a lot] “A DEFENSE OF T-ANY.” *LADI.* February 2017. RP

**One argument that has exploded in popularity as a response to Nebel T and now T – Any is the notion that the neg can read pics against whole res affs**. The reasoning is as follows: “If the aff is whole res, then the neg can easily pic out of 99% of the case. For instance the neg could read a pic only defending one speech code.” **One problem with this argument is that it is self-referential. If the aff would not be able to engage a pic defending only a single speech code, how should the neg be expected to engage an aff that criticizes just one code? In essence, the abuse story that the pic argument paints is that neg pics will be under limited and have little ground to engage them on. The same reasoning applies to specific affs.**

#### PICs are less unfair – smart Affs have preempts to them, and narrow PICs contradict other arguments, which make grouping in the 1AR easy.

**Lallas:** Lallas, Jackson [Debated for Brentwood, liked theory a lot] “A DEFENSE OF T-ANY.” *LADI.* February 2017. RP

**Given how prevalent this argument is, it’s controversial to suggest that the abuse caused by a specific aff and reading a pic are similar or roughly equal**. So I’ll spend some time going into the specifics. **First consider potential ground loss. Specific affs significantly limit neg ground; the neg can only defend one type of speech restriction. This is the same for a 1AR answering a pic – only one type of speech is relevant. A smart aff will also include arguments in their case that indict any restrictions or ban of speech in general to help offset ground loss. Also keep in mind that there are only few arguments in favor of the pic, since it is so similar to the aff, so there won’t be too many different arguments to answer in the 1AR.**

#### If the PICs debate is somewhat close, vote neg – there’s a 100% chance I had to debate against an abusive Aff, and it’s not guaranteed that I would have read a PIC.

**Lallas:** Lallas, Jackson [Debated for Brentwood, liked theory a lot] “A DEFENSE OF T-ANY.” *LADI.* February 2017. RP

**Since the abuse from a specific aff and pic are comparable, the pics argument could actually justify T – Any. It seems like it would be a much better norm to not read the specific aff and create a chance that the round is fair. After all, the neg does not have to read a pic.**

#### This is potential abuse – the fact that an interp might increase the chance of skep being run doesn’t make it a bad interp

**Lallas:** Lallas, Jackson [Debated for Brentwood, liked theory a lot] “A DEFENSE OF T-ANY.” *LADI.* February 2017. RP

**The second problem with the pics argument is that it relies on a faulty line of justification. The argument is essentially ‘because the neg could read an abusive argument, the aff should get an advantage.’ The neg could also read multiple condo, skep, etc. Does the aff need an advantage for the chance that those things happen too? The pics argument wanders too far into the territory of potential abuse.**

#### *My abuse outweighs – you can weigh the case against PICs – you can say that discussion on campuses solves hate speech or win movements offense, while I can’t read a whole res Aff against a plan*

#### *No impact—learning to defend your entire aff solves specific PICs and disads.*

#### *Turn – they exist under your interp too and are even more dangerous since they have to PIC out of smaller, more randomly specific parts of the aff that you won’t have defenses of.*

#### *Reading theory on PICs solves – double bind, either PICs are heinously unfair and they’ll crush on theory, or they’re not that bad and the limits offense outweighs.*

#### *Limits outweighs – this is just potential abuse – at best there’s a 10 percent chance I read a PIC, but 100 percent chance this Aff wasn’t reasonable*

#### *Not intrinsic to my interp – just theoretically reject PICs, too.*

### A2 Disads

#### 1] it’s reciprocal—we get every disad and you get every advantage, which means there’s no net difference—means it’s a question of whether we can reasonably prep

#### 2] our interp gives the neg better options for generics—means that tiny disads are unlikely—they’re also incredibly unlikely to outweigh a whole res aff—the reason you read a plan with this aff is literally that any disad would outweigh its tiny benefit—

#### 3] you get infinite prep for your aff—you should have answers to each disad or at least be able to outweigh them—means you certainly make it worse

#### 4] we at least get *some* debate under our interp—there’s 1nc engagement—the aff results in no engagement post-1AC, so there’s still the opportunity for quantitatively more clash

### A2 Plans Good

#### 1] Not competitive – they get plans, they just can’t specify a type of officer – specify an area in the US instead

#### 2] Plans are permitted – they just have to meet certain guidelines

**Nebel writes:** Nebel, Jake [Owner and Contributor, VBriefly] “The Priority of Resolutional Semantics” *VBriefly*. December 2014. RP

Second, **my view is not that plans are bad**. On the contrary, I think that **plans are good**, but only **when they affirm the resolution. Whether some plan affirms** their resolution (i.e., whether it is topical) **is a function of the resolution’s semantics**. To repeat, I have nothing against plans in general, and I believe that **specification of some resolutional parameter may be permissible**, if not obligatory, on many topics. **One of the great things about LD is that our resolutions are diverse** not only in their subject matter but also **in their structure.** This requires debaters to analyze each resolution with a fresh eye and not simply to import concepts and assumptions that may have applied to old resolutions into theoretical norms for each new one. But **when the only tool you have is a hammer, everything looks like a nail. It is easier to continue with the same assumptions**, as long as they are sufficiently shared by one’s peers on the national circuit, rather than reinventing the theoretical wheel every two months. **It is important to resist this temptation and not to ignore the meaning of the resolution, even and especially if you may be more comfortable debating a different resolution.**

### A2 Implementation Good

#### 1] It’s the wrong T shell prepout; those apply to Aims T but not a shell that criticizes actor spec

#### 2] Turn – implementation often occurs categorically – laws are changed through federal government structures often

### A2 Policy Norms

#### 1] Turn -- many policy debate theorists have concluded that semantics takes lexical priority over pragmatic concerns – this view is a pretty well-developed norm.

**Nebel writes:** Nebel, Jake [Owner and Contributor, VBriefly] “On Specifying Just Governments” *VBriefly*. December 2014. RP

My view probably seems obvious to some people and incoherent to others. Outsiders to national circuit LD may find it ridiculous that anyone would find it necessary to defend it at such length. But some circuit LDers may think that my view rests on a conceptual confusion about topicality. **Argumentation theorists**, however, **have defended the priority of semantics in the context of CEDA**(Murphy 1994), **NPDA** (Merrell 2015), **and NFA LD**(Diers 2010) debate. Why should the view be coherent in these contexts but not in high school LD? Or do these authors simply fail to understand what topicality means? I don’t think that either hypothesis is very credible. **Murphy, Merrell, and Diers argue that pragmatic considerations are circular, unverifiable, self-undermining, subjective, non-unique, and ungrounded in argumentation theory.**

#### 2] Is/ought fallacy – policy debate also has double the speeches, but we still keep LD as it is

### A2 Depth of Education

#### 1] Game over – no education voter was read in this debate, which means you have no impact to any of your internal links and you prefer my fairness arguments].

#### 2] No impact to depth – none of us are going to be involved in \_\_\_ in the rest of our lives. Also depth is impossible in 26 minutes of LD speeches anyway, which means broader knowledge comes first.

#### 3] Turn: Breadth of education o/w depth since we accumulate knowledge about the broader underlying issues across many places. Ensures we have the best understanding of policy in general, which is probably more useful than the hyper-specifics of an area.

#### 4] Non-unique – you can read solvency evidence from specific regions as advantages to your aff – that’s basically what happens in the status quo. You get the specific scenario, you just need to defend all countries.

#### 5] Turn: encourages more depth since evidence that encompasses all nations or general trends is less common, which means we have to go more in depth on the statistics and comparison rather than just finding a new country to defend when people start responding to arguments. Econ education is uniquely critical since it’s a domain of policy that affects all of us as employer/employees.

#### 6] Topical version of the affirmative – you could have just […]

**Solves abuse**

#### a. You can read country specific evidence, you just need to apply it to all countries or argue why it would apply.

#### b. You can read a plan – you just can’t specify a country. Your plans good ev needs to justify why COUNTRY SPEC is uniquely valuable, not just generic “plan focus good”, because all my interp excludes is your ability to select a single country or subset of countries.

#### c. Outweighs your justifications – net benefits to country spec are outweighed by your inconsistency with semantical interps. Even if you’re right that theres some disad to debate as a whole under my interp, its irrelevant cuz the alternative is even worse.

Your education disads are also non-unique. Certain topics favor certain types of discussion, which means my standards o/w on specificity – even if your education is good, it’s not in this instance. **NEBEL**[[1]](#footnote-1)**:** Second, my view is not that plans are bad. On the contrary, I think that plans are good, but only when they affirm the resolution. Whether some plan affirms their resolution (i.e., whether it is topical) is a function of the resolution’s semantics. To repeat, I have nothing against plans in general, and I believe that specification of some resolutional parameter may be permissible, if not obligatory, on many topics. One of the great things about LD is that our resolutions are diverse not only in their subject matter but also in their structure. This requires debaters to analyze each resolution with a fresh eye and not simply to import concepts and assumptions that may have applied to old resolutions into theoretical norms for each new one. But when the only tool you have is a hammer, everything looks like a nail. It is easier to continue with the same assumptions, as long as they are sufficiently shared by one’s peers on the national circuit, rather than reinventing the theoretical wheel every two months. It is important to resist this temptation and not to ignore the meaning of the resolution, even and especially if you may be more comfortable debating a different resolution.

Also turns education because I promote different types of discussion about the meaning of words, which is something we’ll have to deal with as speakers of English.

Linguistic education is also more valuable than anything you reward by complaining about debate-specific problems. **NEBEL**[[2]](#footnote-2)**:** Is Kupferbreg right that debate is its own autonomous context? This is a big question. Some assume that debate should be modeled on external activities in the real world, such as policymaking. Others argue that debate is a game with its own standards of success that need not be modeled on anything else. These views are not very precise, as stated. But we can make them clearer by focusing on the ballot’s question, “Who did the better debating?” Some believe that the standards for good debating are standards that we can straightforwardly apply from other contexts. Others believe that standards for good debating emerge from debate itself. I think the answer must be somewhere in the middle. Standards for good debating have to come from *somewhere* other than competitive academic debate, because debating exists outside of competitive academic debate. The components of good debating, including argumentation, communication, and strategy, have their own standards outside of this bubble. But competitive academic debate combines these components in a way that may result in a somewhat different set of standards. LD is not a simulation of or a training ground for any other specific activity beyond debate, such as law or philosophy. Nor is it an autonomous end-in-itself. Debate is a game, but the game is designed to test and reward certain skills that have purchase outside of the game itself. Analyzing the meaning of a text may be one such skill, and debaters can develop it via a semantic approach to topicality. Changing the topic by appealing to wish lists and hyperboles about ground loss is not such a skill.

### A2 Depth Is Important

#### 1. Modern policymaking requires breadth. CAMBRIDGE explains the argument[[3]](#footnote-3):

These differences matter, if society is in need of more broadly educated leaders and citizens. The case for breadth centres on the proposition that the greatest challenges facing the world today are of huge complexity and global scope, best tackled by people whose education enables them to integrate different fields of knowledge and work across conventional academic boundaries. To cope with the modern world, moreover, all citizens need to be broadly knowledgeable, numerate and computationally skilled as well as literate. A broad, flexible curriculum makes it easier to give students more choice, and greater responsibility for their own education.

This outweighs since the reason why he talks about depth is in the context of policymaking, so I coopt and turn back that warrant

### A2 Topic is Specific:

#### 1] We can just talk about implementation mechanisms and wage rates in multiple countries - even if they differ, that is just a nuance to the aff. The wage rates and policy specifics would differ in each country you defend, but that does not mean it’s no longer OK to talk about multiple countries and many such mechanisms.

#### 2] Not a DA to my interp - you can focus on one nation via your aff offense even if you defend DAs to all countries.

### A2 Normative Aspiration:

Nebel controls the internal link - he says that the only way we could interpret just goverments ought to [..] as a normative aspiration, i.e. something existing governments should strive to achieve, would be if we interpeted as a generic statement; that’s the example of trespassers the card uses since normative generics do not presuppose the existence of just governments, but existential generics, which is your interpretation, do so. Nebel (2) indicates a generic interpretation means you cannot spec, so you are not going to win that argument since only my interpretation allows your intuitive conceptualization of just governments to even make sense.

### A2 Multi Actor Fiat Bad

#### 1] no impact – you defend more nations, and I get more ground to respond to them.

#### 2] implementation mechanisms differing doesn’t mean the resolution is incoherent, it just means the specifics of your advocacy are complex and vary from location to location. You are missing an internal link.

#### 3] no uniqueness since your interp doesn’t solve – there is multi-actor fiat in the 1AC.

## Weighing

### Semantics > Everything

Omitted

### Limits T/ Everything

Omitted

### Advocacy Skills o/w Everything

Omitted

### Depth o/w Breadth

Omitted

# Team FLs

## 2NR to PV

\*\*\*\*Don’t read all the definition stuff and the standards stuff – skip definitions if they read D to semantics first

### Limits

#### Extend limits – they allow an absurd number of Affs – here’s a caselist – the right to say racism bad, the right to have a conversation, writing papers, and more. These Affs have empirically been read – the journalism Aff, speech zones Aff, right for white people to speak, criticize the military Aff, and more. These explode the topic but are also UNBEATABLE – nobody thinks people shouldn’t have the right to say racism is bad.

#### Even if their Aff is uniquely important to debate, limits control the internal link.

**Lallas:** Lallas, Jackson [Debated for Brentwood, liked theory a lot] “A DEFENSE OF T-ANY.” *LADI.* February 2017. RP

This argument is another common response to most T arguments, so naturally it applies to T – Any. **Aff debaters will respond to T by arguing that: “Case [x] is important to talk about and adds educational value to the activity**.” I agree with this argument in spirit. There are a lot of important decisions and policies to talk about, and I’m sure many of the affs that violate T – Any fall among these. **The problem with this argument is that it does not justify why allowing these specific advocacies is a good way to go about learning these issues. In essence, this argument talks about the impact of learning about their position but skirts doing the link work explaining how their interpretation achieves that goal. This response can easily be link turned. If you don’t have the prep to engage their aff, due to limits or poor quality ground, then the in round discussion created is probably not that valuable. The round could teach both debaters more by having them debate on an issue with equitable ground, allowing clash and creating more strategic decisions**

### Restriction W/M

#### Doesn’t answer the shell – even if they meet restrict, the violation stems from not meeting ANY, not RESTRICT

#### Their definition of restrict isn’t mutually exclusive with mine – they CAN DEFEND ZONES UNDER MY INTERP – the only question is if they should also defend eliminating speech codes

#### Restrict is defined by Merriam Webster as

to subject to bounds or limits

#### A restriction on free speech refers to content

**Leonard:** Leonard, James [Director of Law Library and Professor of Law, Ohio Northern University] “Killing with Kindness: Speech Codes in the American Univiersity.” *Ohio Northern University Law Review.* Volume 19. 1993. RP

Although I know of no source which collects the individual speech codes, it is possible to identify a range of prohibited expression from well-publicized cases. **As a general matter, a university has two options in restricting speech. First, it may suppress certain types of ideas. This was the case with the University of Michigan's "Policy on Discrimination and Discriminatory Harassment of Students in the University Environment" (policy) which was struck down in *Doe v. University of Michigan."* The other option is to tolerate ideas but limit the means of expression, for example, by banning racial epithets or derogatory comments in specific contexts. The latter is reflected by the University of Wisconsin's speech code (UW rule) which was overturned in *UMW Post v. Board of Regents.***

**Prefer this definition**

**a. It’s topic specific**

**b. Cites historic precedent**

#### A restriction means a complete elimination

**Caiaccio:** Caiaccio, Kevin T “Are Noncompetition Covenants Among Law Partners Against Public Policy?” Georgia Law Review, Spring, 28 Ga. L. Rev. 807, Lexis). 1994. RP

**The Howard court began its analysis by examining the California Business and Professions Code,** which expressly permits reasonable restrictive covenants among business partners. 139 The court noted that this provision had long applied to doctors and accountants and concluded that the general language of the statute provided no indication of an exception for lawyers. 140 After reaching this conclusion, however, the court noted that, since it had the authority to promulgate a higher standard for lawyers, the statute alone did not necessarily control, 141 and the court therefore proceeded to examine the California Rules of Professional Conduct. 142 The court avoided the apparent conflict between the business statute and the ethics rule by undertaking a strained reading of the rule. **In essence, the court held that the word "restrict" referred only to outright prohibitions, and that a mere "economic consequence" does not equal a prohibition.** 143

Prefer this definition --it considers legal context, and the topic is legal

### A2 1st RTP – Need to Defend Location

#### That was answered above – your definition isnt competitive with mine – we can debate location, but should also discuss codes

### A2 2nd RTP – Common Usage

#### No impact – the resolution uses terms of art, so it’s better to be grounded in the topic

#### Turn -- A restriction is a policy that cuts back on something .

**Merriam Webster:** Merriam Webster [Dictionary] “Restriction.” RP

**something (as a law or rule) that limits <There are *restrictions* on building**. 2 :  an act of limiting :  the condition of being limited

### A2 Cambridge Definition of Any

#### It’s miscut – they use any in the negative sense to refer to NONE – in the context of this resolution, that means the Aff would allow NO RESTRICTIONS on free speech

**Cambridge Dictionary defines any:** Cambridge Dictionary “Any” <http://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/any>. RP

**(used in** [**negative**](http://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/negative)[**statements**](http://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/statement) **and** [**questions**](http://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/question)**)** some, or [**even**](http://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/even) **the** [**smallest**](http://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/small)[**amount**](http://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/amount) (of): **We didn’t have any** [**idea**](http://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/idea) **what the** [**airfare**](http://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/airfare) **would be.** There was [hardly](http://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/hardly) any [snow](http://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/snow) this [winter](http://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/winter). Is there any [hope](http://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/hope) that he will [recover](http://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/recover)? Are any of the [concerts](http://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/concert) on a [Saturday](http://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/saturday) [night](http://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/night)?

#### The use of the word “any” refers to all and is a negative indefinite.

**Kadmon and Landman:** Nirit Kadmon and Fred Landman [Grammar experts, and college professors] “Any.” *Linguistics and Philosophy.* August 1993. RP

**As is well known, any can function in two different ways. On the one hand, it can be a negative polarity item** - POLARITY SENSITIV on the other hand, it has what is called a 'free choice' inte FREE CHOICE (FC) any. In this paper, we will propose a unifie of the semantic and pragmatic effects of any, which applies to its uses. **The use of any as a negative polarity it is illustrated in (1) and (2). (1) I don't have any potatoes**. (2) \*I have any potatoes. According to Ladusaw 1979's well known analysis, negative polarity items (NPIs) are only licensed if they are in the scope of a downward entailing operator. A downward entailing (DE) operator is an operator that reverses the direction of entailment, roughly as specified in (3) (using > for entailment). (3) O is a DE operator iff if A => B then O(B) = O(A). On Ladusaw's account, example (1) is OK because any is in the scope of negation, which, as illustrated in (4), is a DE operator. (4) swim = move I don't move => I don't swim In example (2), any is not licensed, because there is no DE operator that any is in the scope of. Ladusaw's analysis elegantly accounts for a wide range of examples. Besides negative vs. affirmative pairs like (1) and (2), it deals, for example, with examples (5)-(8). (5) At most three girls saw anything. (6) \*At least three girls saw anything. (7) Every girl who saw anything was happy. (8) \*Some girl who saw anything was happy. Assuming, with Generalized Quantifier Theory, that determiners are two place relations between a nominal property and a verbal property, Ladu saw predicts that (5) and (7) are OK because the determiner at most three is DE on its second argument (as well as the first) and the determiner every is DE on its first argument. (6) and (8) are out because at least three and some are not DE on either argument. Ladusaw's analysis of polarity sensitivity is quite successful. It gives semantic content to Klima 1964's suggestion that NPIs are licensed by 'affective' expressions, and it improves upon the analysis of Baker (1970), which is based on licensing by overt negation, in that the notion of DE provides a uniform account of the licensing of NPIs in examples with and without negation. However, there remain some empirical and theoretical issues that Ladusaw's analysis leaves unresolved. We now turn to such issues. We note the four issues summarized in (9), on which we will comment in turn immediately below. (9) constitutes, in fact, a summary of our goals: what we set out to do in this paper is provide an analysis of any that can successfully deal with these four issues. (9)i. the connection between PS any and FC any (goal: a unified analysis); ii. any as an expression which indicates reduced tolerance of ex ceptions; iii. the distribution of the NPI as determined by its meaning and function; iv. empirical problems with the licensing of NPIs I. THE CONNECTION BETWEEN PS ANY AND FC ANY. (10)-(12) are ex amples of free choice any. (10) Any owl hunts mice. (11) Any lawyer could tell you that. (12) I would dance with anybody. Ladusaw (1979) offers a whole battery of arguments that show beyond doubt that PS any is an indefinite with an existential meaning. (Arguments for this are also given by Horn (1972) and others.) FC any, on the other hand, seems to have universal quantificational force. And this goes beyond mere appearance. **Carlson (1981) gives several arguments that FC any is in fact a universal quantifier.** A strong argument is the behavior of almost. Almost is an operator that can modify only universal determiners, as illustrated in (13)-(15). (13) Almost every lawyer could answer that question.(14)Almostnolawyer (15)\*Almostsomelaw As (16) and (17) show, alm strongly suggests that FC (16)Almostanylawye (17)\*Idon'thavealmo (This goes back to Horn absolutely. Note that we alm ost is a sentential ad conclusion - towards w ambiguous:PS any is a universal quantifier.

**Outweighs their definition**

**a. It takes into account the specific grammar rule and the resolution**

**b. Cites experts on grammar**

#### “Any constitutionally protected speech” refers to every use of speech

**Merriam Webster:** “Definition of Any”, *Merriam-Webster*, accessed 2 Dec 2016, https://www.merriam- webster.com/dictionary/any.

1: one or some indiscriminately of whatever kind: a: one or another taken at random <ask any man you meet> b: **every —used to indicate one selected without restriction <any child would know that>**

Outweighs – common usage

#### Legal restrictions use any to refer to all

Black’s Law NO DATE (Black’s Law Dictionary, online legal dictionary, “Law Dictionary: What is ABANDONMENT OF CHILD?” http://thelawdictionary.org/abandonment-of-child///[LADI](http://www.theladi.org/evidence))

**What is ABANDONMENT** OF CHILD? **Deserting** a child and having no intention of fulfilling **any obligations** to the child. **Cutting off** all **relations** and obligations to the child.

### A2 Solves Limits

#### The counterinterp is arbitrary and self-serving – every team can just say only their Aff – prefer predictable and non-arbitrary limits

#### It clearly doesn’t – they can still specify any AREA on campus – speech zones, the cafeteria, dormitories, and more

#### Doesn’t solve ground – there can still be UNBEATABLE Affs – there’s no good way to answer an Aff that says don’t restrict the right to speak privately, but restrict it in the classroom – it would spike out of every hate speech disad.

### A2 Overlimiting

#### No impact – their Aff isnt a core part of the topic – only 1/6 of colleges have zones.

**FIRE:**  Free Speech Zones on Campus <https://www.thefire.org/pdfs/5bed6be4733c1eb18e3adec122073a22.pdf> NO DATE NO SPECIFIC AUTHOR CWLC

Roughly 1 in 6 of America’s top colleges and universities have free speech zones

#### Turn – it’s better to discuss a caselist of fewer Affs, since we can go in depth and learn about those more, as opposed to cursory overviews that don’t cover anything well.

### A2 Research Skills

#### Non unique – there are plans under my interp – you can specify a type of college or university

#### Limits turn their internal link – people wouldn’t be able to answer an Aff that’s SUBSTANTIVELY UNBEATABLE and would just go for bad generics like cap or antiblackness every round

### A2 PICs

#### Reading theory on PICs solves – double bind, either PICs are heinously unfair and they’ll crush on theory, or they’re not that bad and the limits offense outweighs.

#### The PICs offense is non-unique – any theoretical reason a PIC is bad is a reason a super small plan is bad

**Lallas:** Lallas, Jackson [Debated for Brentwood, liked theory a lot] “A DEFENSE OF T-ANY.” *LADI.* February 2017. RP

**One argument that has exploded in popularity as a response to Nebel T and now T – Any is the notion that the neg can read pics against whole res affs**. The reasoning is as follows: “If the aff is whole res, then the neg can easily pic out of 99% of the case. For instance the neg could read a pic only defending one speech code.” **One problem with this argument is that it is self-referential. If the aff would not be able to engage a pic defending only a single speech code, how should the neg be expected to engage an aff that criticizes just one code? In essence, the abuse story that the pic argument paints is that neg pics will be under limited and have little ground to engage them on. The same reasoning applies to specific affs.**

#### PICs are less unfair – smart Affs have preempts to them, and narrow PICs contradict other arguments, which make grouping in the 1AR easy.

**Lallas:** Lallas, Jackson [Debated for Brentwood, liked theory a lot] “A DEFENSE OF T-ANY.” *LADI.* February 2017. RP

**Given how prevalent this argument is, it’s controversial to suggest that the abuse caused by a specific aff and reading a pic are similar or roughly equal**. So I’ll spend some time going into the specifics. **First consider potential ground loss. Specific affs significantly limit neg ground; the neg can only defend one type of speech restriction. This is the same for a 1AR answering a pic – only one type of speech is relevant. A smart aff will also include arguments in their case that indict any restrictions or ban of speech in general to help offset ground loss. Also keep in mind that there are only few arguments in favor of the pic, since it is so similar to the aff, so there won’t be too many different arguments to answer in the 1AR.**

#### If the PICs debate is somewhat close, vote neg – there’s a 100% chance I had to debate against an abusive Aff, and it’s not guaranteed that I would have read a PIC.

**Lallas:** Lallas, Jackson [Debated for Brentwood, liked theory a lot] “A DEFENSE OF T-ANY.” *LADI.* February 2017. RP

**Since the abuse from a specific aff and pic are comparable, the pics argument could actually justify T – Any. It seems like it would be a much better norm to not read the specific aff and create a chance that the round is fair. After all, the neg does not have to read a pic.**

#### This is potential abuse – the fact that an interp might increase the chance of skep being run doesn’t make it a bad interp

**Lallas:** Lallas, Jackson [Debated for Brentwood, liked theory a lot] “A DEFENSE OF T-ANY.” *LADI.* February 2017. RP

**The second problem with the pics argument is that it relies on a faulty line of justification. The argument is essentially ‘because the neg could read an abusive argument, the aff should get an advantage.’ The neg could also read multiple condo, skep, etc. Does the aff need an advantage for the chance that those things happen too? The pics argument wanders too far into the territory of potential abuse.**

#### Turn – they incentivize MORE PICS – negs that don’t have prep against random Affs will go for word PICs or process counterplans.

**Lallas:** Lallas, Jackson [Debated for Brentwood, liked theory a lot] “A DEFENSE OF T-ANY.” *LADI.* February 2017. RP

**Furthermore, reading an aff that violated T – Any would only increase the incentive to read pics. Because of the lack of neg ground and high chance that the neg won’t be able to prep the aff, the neg has every incentive to read word pics or random process pics. Even if the neg doesn’t read a pic, the ground skew still incentivizes reading a position that moots the aff and mimics the abuse of pics.**

#### My abuse outweighs – you can weigh the case against PICs – you can say that discussion on campuses solves hate speech or win movements offense, while I can’t read a whole res Aff against a plan

#### Turn – they exist under your interp too and are even more dangerous since they have to PIC out of smaller, more randomly specific parts of the aff that you won’t have defenses of.

#### Limits outweighs – this is just potential abuse – at best there’s a 10 percent chance I read a PIC, but 100 percent chance this Aff wasn’t reasonable

#### No impact—learning to defend your entire aff solves specific PICs and disads.

#### Turn – small plans incentivize process counterplans or word PICs, since negs aren’t prepared to debate specifics

## 2NR to HW – New T answers???

\*\*\*\*Don’t read all the definition stuff and the standards stuff – skip definitions if they read D to semantics first

### Limits

#### Extend limits – they allow an absurd number of Affs – here’s a caselist – the right to say racism bad, the right to have a conversation, writing papers, and more. These Affs have empirically been read – the journalism Aff, speech zones Aff, right for white people to speak, criticize the military Aff, and more. These explode the topic but are also UNBEATABLE – nobody thinks people shouldn’t have the right to say racism is bad.

#### Even if their Aff is uniquely important to debate, limits control the internal link.

**Lallas:** Lallas, Jackson [Debated for Brentwood, liked theory a lot] “A DEFENSE OF T-ANY.” *LADI.* February 2017. RP

This argument is another common response to most T arguments, so naturally it applies to T – Any. **Aff debaters will respond to T by arguing that: “Case [x] is important to talk about and adds educational value to the activity**.” I agree with this argument in spirit. There are a lot of important decisions and policies to talk about, and I’m sure many of the affs that violate T – Any fall among these. **The problem with this argument is that it does not justify why allowing these specific advocacies is a good way to go about learning these issues. In essence, this argument talks about the impact of learning about their position but skirts doing the link work explaining how their interpretation achieves that goal. This response can easily be link turned. If you don’t have the prep to engage their aff, due to limits or poor quality ground, then the in round discussion created is probably not that valuable. The round could teach both debaters more by having them debate on an issue with equitable ground, allowing clash and creating more strategic decisions**

### C/I Venue

#### They violate the counterinterp – a venue is a location, not a specific medium

**Merriam Webster defines venue:** Merriam Webster “Venue.” RP

the place from which a jury is drawn and in which trial is held <requested a change of venue> b :  **the place or county in which take place the alleged events from which a legal action arises** c :  a statement showing that a case is brought to the proper court or authority. [locale](https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/locale) 1; **also :  a place where events of a specific type are held** <music venues> b :  [outlet](https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/outlet) 1c

#### Doesn’t solve any of the limits offense – they can still specify any random newspaper, or area on campus – they still get the speech zones Aff, their Aff, the protests Aff, and more.

### A2 Cambridge Definition of Any

#### It’s miscut – they use any in the negative sense to refer to NONE – in the context of this resolution, that means the Aff would allow NO RESTRICTIONS on free speech

**Cambridge Dictionary defines any:** Cambridge Dictionary “Any” <http://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/any>. RP

**(used in** [**negative**](http://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/negative)[**statements**](http://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/statement) **and** [**questions**](http://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/question)**)** some, or [**even**](http://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/even) **the** [**smallest**](http://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/small)[**amount**](http://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/amount) (of): **We didn’t have any** [**idea**](http://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/idea) **what the** [**airfare**](http://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/airfare) **would be.** There was [hardly](http://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/hardly) any [snow](http://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/snow) this [winter](http://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/winter). Is there any [hope](http://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/hope) that he will [recover](http://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/recover)? Are any of the [concerts](http://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/concert) on a [Saturday](http://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/saturday) [night](http://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/night)?

#### The use of the word “any” refers to all and is a negative indefinite.

**Kadmon and Landman:** Nirit Kadmon and Fred Landman [Grammar experts, and college professors] “Any.” *Linguistics and Philosophy.* August 1993. RP

**As is well known, any can function in two different ways. On the one hand, it can be a negative polarity item** - POLARITY SENSITIV on the other hand, it has what is called a 'free choice' inte FREE CHOICE (FC) any. In this paper, we will propose a unifie of the semantic and pragmatic effects of any, which applies to its uses. **The use of any as a negative polarity it is illustrated in (1) and (2). (1) I don't have any potatoes**. (2) \*I have any potatoes. According to Ladusaw 1979's well known analysis, negative polarity items (NPIs) are only licensed if they are in the scope of a downward entailing operator. A downward entailing (DE) operator is an operator that reverses the direction of entailment, roughly as specified in (3) (using > for entailment). (3) O is a DE operator iff if A => B then O(B) = O(A). On Ladusaw's account, example (1) is OK because any is in the scope of negation, which, as illustrated in (4), is a DE operator. (4) swim = move I don't move => I don't swim In example (2), any is not licensed, because there is no DE operator that any is in the scope of. Ladusaw's analysis elegantly accounts for a wide range of examples. Besides negative vs. affirmative pairs like (1) and (2), it deals, for example, with examples (5)-(8). (5) At most three girls saw anything. (6) \*At least three girls saw anything. (7) Every girl who saw anything was happy. (8) \*Some girl who saw anything was happy. Assuming, with Generalized Quantifier Theory, that determiners are two place relations between a nominal property and a verbal property, Ladu saw predicts that (5) and (7) are OK because the determiner at most three is DE on its second argument (as well as the first) and the determiner every is DE on its first argument. (6) and (8) are out because at least three and some are not DE on either argument. Ladusaw's analysis of polarity sensitivity is quite successful. It gives semantic content to Klima 1964's suggestion that NPIs are licensed by 'affective' expressions, and it improves upon the analysis of Baker (1970), which is based on licensing by overt negation, in that the notion of DE provides a uniform account of the licensing of NPIs in examples with and without negation. However, there remain some empirical and theoretical issues that Ladusaw's analysis leaves unresolved. We now turn to such issues. We note the four issues summarized in (9), on which we will comment in turn immediately below. (9) constitutes, in fact, a summary of our goals: what we set out to do in this paper is provide an analysis of any that can successfully deal with these four issues. (9)i. the connection between PS any and FC any (goal: a unified analysis); ii. any as an expression which indicates reduced tolerance of ex ceptions; iii. the distribution of the NPI as determined by its meaning and function; iv. empirical problems with the licensing of NPIs I. THE CONNECTION BETWEEN PS ANY AND FC ANY. (10)-(12) are ex amples of free choice any. (10) Any owl hunts mice. (11) Any lawyer could tell you that. (12) I would dance with anybody. Ladusaw (1979) offers a whole battery of arguments that show beyond doubt that PS any is an indefinite with an existential meaning. (Arguments for this are also given by Horn (1972) and others.) FC any, on the other hand, seems to have universal quantificational force. And this goes beyond mere appearance. **Carlson (1981) gives several arguments that FC any is in fact a universal quantifier.** A strong argument is the behavior of almost. Almost is an operator that can modify only universal determiners, as illustrated in (13)-(15). (13) Almost every lawyer could answer that question.(14)Almostnolawyer (15)\*Almostsomelaw As (16) and (17) show, alm strongly suggests that FC (16)Almostanylawye (17)\*Idon'thavealmo (This goes back to Horn absolutely. Note that we alm ost is a sentential ad conclusion - towards w ambiguous:PS any is a universal quantifier.

**Outweighs their definition**

**a. It takes into account the specific grammar rule and the resolution**

**b. Cites experts on grammar**

#### “Any constitutionally protected speech” refers to every use of speech

**Merriam Webster:** “Definition of Any”, *Merriam-Webster*, accessed 2 Dec 2016, https://www.merriam- webster.com/dictionary/any.

1: one or some indiscriminately of whatever kind: a: one or another taken at random <ask any man you meet> b: **every —used to indicate one selected without restriction <any child would know that>**

Outweighs – common usage

### A2 SCOTUS/Blevins

#### This is SO miscut it’s not even funny – they highlighted stuff from 3 sentences apart – the card does NOT say that any didn’t mean all in the case they’re discussing

#### This is specific to interstate contracts – read the minimized text – it’s definitely not about anything relevant

#### Legal context – tons of court rulings have established “any” as “all”.

**Elder:** Elder (David S. Elder, October 1991, "Any and All": To Use Or Not To Use?” "Plain Language' is a regular feature of the Michigan Bar Journal, edited by Joseph Kimble for the State Bar Plain English Committee. Assistant editor is George H. Hathaway,

**The Michigan Supreme Court seemed to approve our dictionary definitions of "any" in Harrington v Interstate Business Men's Accident** Ass'n, 210 Mich 327, 330; 178 NW 19 (1920), when it quoted Hopkins v Sanders, 172 Mich 227; 137 NW 709 (1912). **The Court defined "any" like this: "In broad language, it covers 'arl'v final decree' in 'any suit at law or in chancery' in 'any circuit court.' Any' means ,every,' 'each one of all."'** In a later case**, the Michigan Supreme Court again held that the use of "any" in an agency contract meant "all." In Gibson v Agricultural Life** Ins Co, 282 Mich 282, 284; 276 NW 450 (1937), the clause in controversy read: "14. The Company shall have, and is hereby given a first lien upon any commissions or renewals as security for any claim due or to become due to the Company from said Agent." (Emphasis added.) **The Gibson court was not persuaded by the plaintiff's insistence that the word "any" meant less than "all": "Giving the wording of paragraph 14 oJ the agency contract its plain and unequivocable meaning, upon arriving at the conclusion that the sensible connotation of the word any' implies 'all' and not 'some,'** the legal conclusion follows that the defendant is entitled to retain the earned renewal commissions arising from its agency contract with Gibson and cannot be held legally liable for same in this action," Gibson at 287 (quoting the trial court opinion). **The Michigan Court of Appeals** has **similarly interpreted the word "any" as used in a Michigan statute. In McGrath v Clark**, 89 Mich App 194; 280 NW2d 480 (1979), the plaintiff accepted defendant's offer of judgment. The offer said nothing about prejudgment interest. **The statute the Court examined was MCL 600.6013; MSA 27A.6013: "Interest shall be allowed on any money judgment recovered in a civil action...." The Court held that "the word 'any' is to be considered all-inclusive,"** so the defendants were entitled to interest. McGrath at 197 Recently, the Court has again held that "[alny means 'every,' 'each one of all,' and is unlimited in its scope." Parker v Nationwide Mutual Ins Co, 188 Mich App 354, 356; 470 NW2d 416 (1991) (quoting Harrington v InterState Men's Accident Ass'n, supra)

#### Flag desecreation statutes prove.

Danilina S., [staff writer for black’s law dictionary], “Is Flag Burning Illegal?”. *Blacks Law Dictionary.* RP

Interesting that the burning of the flag has been against the law until 1969. The first U.S. Supreme Court ruling on flag desecration was passed in 1907 in Halter vs. Nebraska case. **Most early flag desecration statutes prohibited burning a flag or any other ways of disrespecting the flag.** Later, in 1968, Congress responded to the burning of the American flag in the Central Park as the protest against the Vietnam War by passing the Federal Flag Desecration Law. **This law prohibited** any **display of “contempt” directed against the flag. Thus, burning of the American flag had been** illegal until 1969 when the Supreme Court ruled the decision to award the First Amendment protection to the burning of the flag.

### A2 No Limits Offense – A Point – PICs

#### Empirically this is non unique – I’ve read PICs against Harvard Westlake’s journalism Aff ALL THE TIME – I’ve read the hate speech PIC, holocaust denial PIC, and more – disproves their argument.

#### Reading theory on PICs solves – double bind, either PICs are heinously unfair and they’ll crush on theory, or they’re not that bad and the limits offense outweighs.

#### Turn – they exist under your interp too and are even more dangerous since they have to PIC out of smaller, more randomly specific parts of the aff that you won’t have defenses of.

#### No impact—learning to defend your entire aff solves specific PICs and disads.

#### Turn – they incentivize MORE PICS – negs that don’t have prep against random Affs will go for word PICs or process counterplans.

**Lallas:** Lallas, Jackson [Debated for Brentwood, liked theory a lot] “A DEFENSE OF T-ANY.” *LADI.* February 2017. RP

**Furthermore, reading an aff that violated T – Any would only increase the incentive to read pics. Because of the lack of neg ground and high chance that the neg won’t be able to prep the aff, the neg has every incentive to read word pics or random process pics. Even if the neg doesn’t read a pic, the ground skew still incentivizes reading a position that moots the aff and mimics the abuse of pics.**

### A2 No Limits Offense – B] Point Functional Checks

#### Empirically denied – the Harvard Westlake Aff, Newark Aff, Peninsula Aff, Military Academy Affs, Criticize Military Aff, White People Aff and more – this is just a lie

#### The newspapers aff in particular is unfair.

**Lallas:** Lallas, Jackson [Debated for Brentwood, liked theory a lot] “A DEFENSE OF T-ANY.” *LADI.* February 2017. RP

**Speech in newspapers serves vital, easily articulable functions such as the ability to criticize institutions, share events with other students, give people a voice, etc. These impacts are much more powerful and persuasive than the philosophical benefits of free speech in general. In contrast, the arguments against this speech are much weaker. There’s only a small link to hate speech style arguments about offensive publications** and potentially a small link to kritiks of free speech.

### A2 No Limits Offense – C] Point Aff Ground Outweighs

#### Side bias flips Aff on this topic

**Lallas:** Lallas, Jackson [Debated for Brentwood, liked theory a lot] “A DEFENSE OF T-ANY.” *LADI.* February 2017. RP

I also think that the difficulty often comes from non-substantive concerns. Theory and Kritiks have been classically hard strategies for the aff to deal with. It’s layering more than any neg substantive advantage that causes the problem. Specific advocacies are a misguided way to address the issue. **Lastly I don’t think that affirming is that difficult on this topic. Almost any theory interpretation against a whole res aff is frivolous and stock aff arguments interact well with kritiks. The set of neg arguments on substantive is already not super expansive which makes it very manageable to prep them out. The high quality whole res ground mentioned earlier also helps answer this argument.** Side bias statistics would be helpful in gauging the accuracy of this argument.

#### You can weigh the case against PICs – you can say that discussion on campuses solves hate speech or win movements offense, while I can’t read a whole res Aff against a plan

#### Better case writing solves – just change your advantages

#### Turn – they can straight turn the net benefit for the entire 1AR, which flips the direction of time skew against me.

## 2NR to HW – Usual

### Limits

#### Extend limits – they allow an absurd number of Affs – here’s a caselist – the right to say racism bad, the right to have a conversation, writing papers, and more. These Affs have empirically been read – the journalism Aff, speech zones Aff, right for white people to speak, criticize the military Aff, and more. These explode the topic but are also UNBEATABLE – nobody thinks people shouldn’t have the right to say racism is bad.

#### Even if their Aff is uniquely important to debate, limits control the internal link.

**Lallas:** Lallas, Jackson [Debated for Brentwood, liked theory a lot] “A DEFENSE OF T-ANY.” *LADI.* February 2017. RP

This argument is another common response to most T arguments, so naturally it applies to T – Any. **Aff debaters will respond to T by arguing that: “Case [x] is important to talk about and adds educational value to the activity**.” I agree with this argument in spirit. There are a lot of important decisions and policies to talk about, and I’m sure many of the affs that violate T – Any fall among these. **The problem with this argument is that it does not justify why allowing these specific advocacies is a good way to go about learning these issues. In essence, this argument talks about the impact of learning about their position but skirts doing the link work explaining how their interpretation achieves that goal. This response can easily be link turned. If you don’t have the prep to engage their aff, due to limits or poor quality ground, then the in round discussion created is probably not that valuable. The round could teach both debaters more by having them debate on an issue with equitable ground, allowing clash and creating more strategic decisions**

### C/I Venue

#### They violate the counterinterp – a venue is a location, not a specific medium

**Merriam Webster defines venue:** Merriam Webster “Venue.” RP

the place from which a jury is drawn and in which trial is held <requested a change of venue> b :  **the place or county in which take place the alleged events from which a legal action arises** c :  a statement showing that a case is brought to the proper court or authority. [locale](https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/locale) 1; **also :  a place where events of a specific type are held** <music venues> b :  [outlet](https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/outlet) 1c

#### Doesn’t solve any of the limits offense – they can still specify any random newspaper, or area on campus – they still get the speech zones Aff, their Aff, the protests Aff, and more.

### C/I Solvency Advocate + Spillover

#### 1] They violate – they don’t have a solvency advocate – their plan text literally just says to do it but doesn’t have any author for it. No new 2AR distinctinos here

#### 2] Solvency advocate doesn’t solve any of the ground offense – someone probably wrote an article about why we should allow people to say anti-racist speech on campus, but it’s still unturnable

#### 3] Spillover doesn’t solve – links to disads and Ks obviously come from the plan text, not from advantage areas – the Aff is still smaller

#### 4] Spillover doesn’t solve – it’s difficult to assess the scope of the spillover claim made, and it wasn’t even clear in the 1AC, which affects the scope of the link

### SCOTUS Definition of Any

#### 1] My definition on field context outweighs – it’s actually in the context of free speech

#### 2] My definition outweighs – Merriam Webster is the most common dictionary in the world – any isn’t a legal term but just a grammatical one

#### 3] Even if legal definitions matter, you lose -- legal restrictions use any to refer to all

Black’s Law (Black’s Law Dictionary, online legal dictionary, “Law Dictionary: What is ABANDONMENT OF CHILD?” http://thelawdictionary.org/abandonment-of-child

**What is ABANDONMENT** OF CHILD? **Deserting** a child and having no intention of fulfilling **any obligations** to the child. **Cutting off** all **relations** and obligations to the child.

#### 4] My definition outweighs – it’s in the context of “any” being a negative – the resolution says ought NOT restrict any, which isnt the same as any in a positive sense

### Clash

#### Even if their Aff is uniquely important to debate, limits control the internal link.

**Lallas:** Lallas, Jackson [Debated for Brentwood, liked theory a lot] “A DEFENSE OF T-ANY.” *LADI.* February 2017. RP

This argument is another common response to most T arguments, so naturally it applies to T – Any. **Aff debaters will respond to T by arguing that: “Case [x] is important to talk about and adds educational value to the activity**.” I agree with this argument in spirit. There are a lot of important decisions and policies to talk about, and I’m sure many of the affs that violate T – Any fall among these. **The problem with this argument is that it does not justify why allowing these specific advocacies is a good way to go about learning these issues. In essence, this argument talks about the impact of learning about their position but skirts doing the link work explaining how their interpretation achieves that goal. This response can easily be link turned. If you don’t have the prep to engage their aff, due to limits or poor quality ground, then the in round discussion created is probably not that valuable. The round could teach both debaters more by having them debate on an issue with equitable ground, allowing clash and creating more strategic decisions**

#### Their Aff is terrible for clash.

**Lallas:** Lallas, Jackson [Debated for Brentwood, liked theory a lot] “A DEFENSE OF T-ANY.” *LADI.* February 2017. RP

**Speech in newspapers serves vital, easily articulable functions such as the ability to criticize institutions, share events with other students, give people a voice, etc. These impacts are much more powerful and persuasive than the philosophical benefits of free speech in general. In contrast, the arguments against this speech are much weaker. There’s only a small link to hate speech style arguments about offensive publications** and potentially a small link to kritiks of free speech.

#### People are just forced to generics under their interp and never really debate the Aff.

**Lallas:** Lallas, Jackson [Debated for Brentwood, liked theory a lot] “A DEFENSE OF T-ANY.” *LADI.* February 2017. RP

**A deeper concern is that these affs incentivize bad engagement. An example of this was the 50 states counterplan seen commonly against plans last year. Instead of creating an actual discussion of the aff, rounds have been bogged down by random implementation issues and cheap shot neg strategies. I find that many neg positions read in response to these affs are about as engaging as moral skepticism.** The incentive to read word pics and uplayer I mentioned in response to the pics objection also applies here.

#### The free speech and journalism Affs aren’t educational – they’re based on nuances of administrator concern

**Lallas:** Lallas, Jackson [Debated for Brentwood, liked theory a lot] “A DEFENSE OF T-ANY.” *LADI.* February 2017. RP

**On another level, there is not much educational value to researching objections to many affs that violate T – Any. Take the free speech zones aff and journalism aff as examples. Most of the arguments in favor of those policies are based on administrative or institutional concerns. Schools don’t want their image tarnished in a paper or to have a public safety hazard during a protest. We don’t learn that much by reading about these arguments, and they also transfer over to debate poorly.**

### PICs – Top Level

#### Empirically this is non unique – I’ve read PICs against Harvard Westlake’s journalism Aff ALL THE TIME – I’ve read the hate speech PIC, holocaust denial PIC, and more – disproves their argument.

#### Reading theory on PICs solves – double bind, either PICs are heinously unfair and they’ll crush on theory, or they’re not that bad and the limits offense outweighs.

#### Turn – they exist under your interp too and are even more dangerous since they have to PIC out of smaller, more randomly specific parts of the aff that you won’t have defenses of.

#### No impact—learning to defend your entire aff solves specific PICs and disads.

#### Turn – they incentivize MORE PICS – negs that don’t have prep against random Affs will go for word PICs or process counterplans.

**Lallas:** Lallas, Jackson [Debated for Brentwood, liked theory a lot] “A DEFENSE OF T-ANY.” *LADI.* February 2017. RP

**Furthermore, reading an aff that violated T – Any would only increase the incentive to read pics. Because of the lack of neg ground and high chance that the neg won’t be able to prep the aff, the neg has every incentive to read word pics or random process pics. Even if the neg doesn’t read a pic, the ground skew still incentivizes reading a position that moots the aff and mimics the abuse of pics.**

### Weighing – Top Level Answers [insert wherever you want]

#### PICs are less unfair – smart Affs have preempts to them, and narrow PICs contradict other arguments, which make grouping in the 1AR easy.

**Lallas:** Lallas, Jackson [Debated for Brentwood, liked theory a lot] “A DEFENSE OF T-ANY.” *LADI.* February 2017. RP

**Given how prevalent this argument is, it’s controversial to suggest that the abuse caused by a specific aff and reading a pic are similar or roughly equal**. So I’ll spend some time going into the specifics. **First consider potential ground loss. Specific affs significantly limit neg ground; the neg can only defend one type of speech restriction. This is the same for a 1AR answering a pic – only one type of speech is relevant. A smart aff will also include arguments in their case that indict any restrictions or ban of speech in general to help offset ground loss. Also keep in mind that there are only few arguments in favor of the pic, since it is so similar to the aff, so there won’t be too many different arguments to answer in the 1AR.**

#### If the PICs debate is somewhat close, vote neg – there’s a 100% chance I had to debate against an abusive Aff, and it’s not guaranteed that I would have read a PIC.

**Lallas:** Lallas, Jackson [Debated for Brentwood, liked theory a lot] “A DEFENSE OF T-ANY.” *LADI.* February 2017. RP

**Since the abuse from a specific aff and pic are comparable, the pics argument could actually justify T – Any. It seems like it would be a much better norm to not read the specific aff and create a chance that the round is fair. After all, the neg does not have to read a pic.**

#### This is potential abuse – the fact that an interp might increase the chance of skep being run doesn’t make it a bad interp

**Lallas:** Lallas, Jackson [Debated for Brentwood, liked theory a lot] “A DEFENSE OF T-ANY.” *LADI.* February 2017. RP

**The second problem with the pics argument is that it relies on a faulty line of justification. The argument is essentially ‘because the neg could read an abusive argument, the aff should get an advantage.’ The neg could also read multiple condo, skep, etc. Does the aff need an advantage for the chance that those things happen too? The pics argument wanders too far into the territory of potential abuse.**

### Weighing – Generics Cope

#### That still doesn’t solve any education offense – recycling the same Cap or Afropess K from several topics ago isn’t good for education since we don’t discuss nuances of the topic

#### It still benefits the Aff – they can frontline the few good generic options and just script the 1AR if the only neg option is 2 Ks

#### Generics aren’t quality arguments – most of them don’t have nuanced links to plans, so a good, specific 1AR kills them

### Weighing – Moots 1AC

#### You can weigh the case against PICs – you can say that discussion on campuses solves hate speech or win movements offense, while I can’t read a whole res Aff against a plan

#### Better case writing solves – just change your advantages

#### Turn – they can straight turn the net benefit for the entire 1AR, which flips the direction of time skew against me.
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